REMARKS

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicant thanks the Examiner for carefully considering this application and for courtesies extended during the Examiner Interview conducted on October 16, 2007.

Disposition of Claims

Claims 1-11, 13-20, 22, 23, 27-38, 51-59, 61, 65, 76-87, 110-114, 116, 119, 127, 131, 135, and 141-144 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 51, and 141 are independent. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 51, and 141.

Claim Amendments

Independent claims 1, 51, and 141 have been amended for clarification of the invention. No new subject matter is added by way of these amendments. Support for these amendments may be found, for example, at least on pages 4 and 5 of the Specification.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-8, 15, 16, 28-30, 35, 38, 51-56, 76-78, 83, 85, 86, 111, 112, 114, 131, 135, and 141-144 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 5,594,509 ("Florin") in view of US Patent No. 5,828.402 ("Collings") and US Patent No. 6,181,364 ("Ford"). To the extent that this rejection may still apply to the amended claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness "...the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations." (*See* MPEP §2143.03). Further, "all words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior

art." (*See* MPEP §2143.03). The Applicant respectfully asserts that the references, when combined, fail to teach or suggest all the claim limitations of amended independent claims 1, 51, and 141.

Turning to the rejection of the claims, the independent claims recite that one of only audio access and only visual access is prohibited by the decoder when complete access rights are not received for a program displayed in the mosaic. Further, the independent claims have been amended to recite that the audio or visual access is prohibited after a predetermined length of time. That is, during the predetermined length of time, complete access to the program in the mosaic is permitted. Only *after such a predetermined length* of time, *e.g.,* 30 seconds, when it is clear that the user does not have access rights to the program, is only audio or only visual access cut off. As admitted by the Examiner on page 4 of the Action mailed on January 28, 2008, Florin fails to teach or suggest prohibiting only audio or only visual access after a predetermined length of time. Rather, Floin teaches a *preview* of a pay-per-view program. As discussed during the Examiner Interview of October 16, 2007, and agreed to by the Examiner, a preview, by definition, is simply a short version of a complete program – with both visual and audio access permitted during the preview. A preview does not, by definition, prohibit one of only audio access and only visual access, as required by the independent claims.

Further, Collings and Ford fail to supply that which Floin lacks. Collings teaches a V-chip decoder that completely blocks content if it is considered too offensive. The blocking of such offensive content may be overridden through the use of a PIN code. In Collings, the PIN code (and the settings for blocking) are provided by the user, and offensive content is completely blocked for the entirety of its duration (*i.e.*, there is no preview or any equivalent of a preview of the offensive

content). Ford teaches another V-chip decoder that may block offensive audio or video. As some lead time may be required by some components, a delay time is provided in the method taught by Ford. Ford explicitly mentions that the notification of an event to block content is sent before the event itself, so that the event is effectively blocked by the decoder (*see* Ford, col. 8, 11. 17-20). In other words, no access to the offensive content is provided at all in Ford.

Thus, it is clear that both Collings and Ford fail to teach both providing complete access to a mosaic program for a predetermined length of time, and subsequently, after the predetermined length of time, taking away either one of audio and visual access, as required by the amended independent claims. Rather, both Collings and Ford teach that no offensive content whatsoever is rendered to the user.

In view of the above, it is clear that the Florin, Collings, and Ford, whether considered separately or in combination, fail to render amended independent claims 1, 51, and 141 obvious. Pending dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 9, 10, 57, and 58 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Florin, Collings, Ford, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,874,936 ("Berstis"). To the extent that this rejection may still apply to the amended claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

As described above, Florin Collings, and Ford fail to teach the limitations of independent claims 1 and 51. Further, Berstis fails to supply that which Florin, Collings, and Ford lack, as evidenced by the fact that the Examiner relies on Berstis solely for the purpose of teaching a "automatically re-positioning the cursor in the event that the cursor is placed over the window that

is not active," where the cursor is repositioned either immediately or after a predetermined length of time (*see* Action mailed January 28, 2008, page 12).

In view of the above, it is clear that independent claims 1 and 51 are patentable over Florin, Collings, Ford, and Berstis, whether considered separately or in combination. Further, dependent claims 9, 10, 57, and 58 are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 11, 13, 59, and 61 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Florin, Collings, and Ford, and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0101452 ("Hanaya"). To the extent that this rejection may still apply to the amended claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

As described above, Florin, Collings, and Ford fail to teach the limitations of independent claims 1 and 51. Further, Hanaya fails to supply that which Florin, Collings, and Ford lack, as evidenced by the fact that Hanaya is relied upon solely for the purpose of teaching changing attributes of a cursor depending on the characteristic of a program/channel displayed in a window over which the cursor is positioned (*see* Action mailed January 28, 2008, page 13).

In view of the above, it is clear that independent claims 1 and 51 are patentable over Florin, Collings, Ford, and Hanaya, whether considered separately or in combination. Further, dependent claims 11, 13, 59, 61, and 142 are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 14 and 110 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Florin, Collings, Ford, Hanaya and further in view of US. Patent No. 5,809,204 ("Young"). To the

extent that this rejection may still apply to the amended claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

As described above, Florin, Collings, Ford, and Hanaya fail to teach the limitations of independent claims 1 and 51. Further, Young fails to supply that which Florin, Collings, Ford, and Hanaya lack, as evidenced by the fact that Young is relied upon solely for the purpose of teaching receiving data for assigning the characteristic from a remote control handset (*see* Action mailed January 28, 2008, page 16).

In view of the above, it is clear that independent claims 1 and 51 are patentable over Florin, Collings, Ford, Hanaya, and Young, whether considered separately or in combination. Dependent claims 14 and 110 are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 17, 18, 65, 119, and 127 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Florin, Collings, Ford, and further in view of US Patent No. 5,903,314 ("Niijima"). To the extent that this rejection may still apply to the amended claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

As described above, Florin and Collings, Ford fail to teach the limitations of independent claims 1 and 51. Further, Niijima fails to supply that which Florin and Collings, Ford lack, as evidenced by the fact that the Examiner relies on Niijima solely for the purpose of teaching a "receiving data by communicating with a communications center to obtain information regarding the program displayed in the mosaic window" and "the relative positions of windows of the mosaic

formation are controlled in response to received positioning data for controlling relative positions of windows within the mosaic formation" (*see* Action mailed January 28, 2008, pages 17-18).

In view of the above, it is clear that independent claims 1 and 51 are patentable over Florin, Collings, Ford, and Niijima, whether considered separately or in combination. Further, dependent claims 17, 18, 65, 119, and 127 are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 19 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Florin, Collings, Ford, Niijima, and further in view of WO 96/37996 ("Townsend"). To the extent that this rejection may still apply to the amended claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

As described above, Florin, Collings, Ford, and Niijima fail to teach or suggest the limitations of independent claims 1 and 51. Further, Townsend fails to supply that which Florin, Collings, Ford, and Niijima lack, as evidenced by the fact that Townsend is relied upon solely for the purpose of teaching dialing up the communications center to supply a request for information about a displayed program and receiving access rights from a remote control handset associated with the decoder (*see* Action mailed January 28, 2008, page 19).

In view of the above, it is clear that amended independent claims 1 and 51 are patentable over Florin, Collings, Ford, Niijima, and Townsend, whether considered separately or in combination. Dependent claim 19 is patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 20, 22, and 113 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Florin, Collings, Ford, and Young. To the extent that this rejection may still apply to the amended claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

As described above, Florin and Collings, Ford fail to teach or suggest the limitations of amended independent claims 1 and 51. Further, Young fails to supply that which Florin and Collings, Ford lack, as evidenced by the fact that for rejecting claims 20 and 113, Young is used by the Examiner solely for the purpose of teaching a means for generating a display comprising a forthcoming program schedule for the channel displayed in the desired window (*see* Action mailed January 28, 2008, page 20). With respect to claims 22, the Examiner relies on Young solely for the purpose of teaching a forthcoming schedule and the textual display of program schedule information (*see* Action mailed January 28, 2008, pages 20-21).

In view of the above, it is clear that amended independent claims 1 and 51 are patentable over Florin, Collings, Ford, and Young, whether considered separately or in combination. Dependent claims 20, 22, and 113 are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 23 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Florin, Collings, Ford, and Young and further in view of US Patent No. 5,815,145 ("Matthews"). To the extent that this rejection may still apply to the amended claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

As described above, none of Florin, Collings, Ford, and Young teach the limitations of amended independent claims 1 and 51. Further, Matthews fails to supply that which Florin,

Collings, Ford, and Young lack, as evidenced by the fact that the Examiner relies on Matthews solely for the purpose of teaching a forthcoming schedule with pictorial images, and that the pictorial images comprise video footage (*see* Action mailed January 28, 2008, page 21).

In view of the above, it is clear that amended independent claims 1 and 51 are patentable over Florin, Collings, Ford, Young, and Matthews whether considered separately or in combination. Dependent claims 23 and 27 are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 31, 33, 36, 56, 79, 84, and 116 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Florin, Collings, Ford, Young, and Matthews. To the extent that this rejection may still apply to the amended claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

As described above, none of Florin, Collings, Ford, and Young teach the limitations of amended independent claims 1 and 51. And again, the Examiner relies on Matthews solely for the purpose of teaching specific details recited in the various rejected dependent claims, such as a picture displayed in the window instead of at least the portion of video, that the picture comprises an image associated with the program displayed in the mosaic, that the further video information is promotional video information (*see* Action mailed January 28, 2008, pages 22-23).

In view of the above, it is clear that amended independent claims 1 and 51 are patentable over Florin, Collings, Ford, Young, and Matthews, whether considered separately or in combination. Dependent claims 31, 33, 36, 56, 79, 84, and 116 are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 32, 80, and 81 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Florin, Collings, Ford, Matthews, and further in view of US Patent No. 5,663,757 ("Morales"). To the extent that this rejection may still apply to the amended claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

As described above, none of Florin, Collings, Ford, and Matthews teach the limitations of amended independent claims 1 and 51. Further, Morales fails to supply that which Florin, Collings, Ford, and Matthews lack, as evidenced by the fact that the Examiner relies on Morales solely for the purpose of teaching that a picture comprises a logo associated with a channel displayed in the mosaic window (*see* Action mailed January 28, 2008, page 24). Thus, it is clear that amended independent claims 1 and 51 are patentable over Florin, Collings, Ford, Matthews, and Morales, whether considered separately or in combination. Dependent claims 32, 80, and 81 are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 34 and 82 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Florin, Collings, Ford, and further in view of US Publication No. 2001/0052135 ("Balak"). To the extent that this rejection may still apply to the amended claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

As described above, none of Florin, Collings, and Ford teach the limitations of amended independent claims 1 and 51. Further, Balak fails to supply that which Florin, Collings, and Ford lack, as evidenced by the fact that the Examiner relies on Balak solely for the purpose of teaching that advertisements displayed in the mosaic window (*see* Action mailed January 28, 2008, page 25). Thus, it is clear that amended independent claims 1 and 51 are patentable over Florin, Collings, Ford, and Balak, whether considered separately or in combination. Dependent claims 32, 80, and

81 are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 37 and 85 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Florin, Collings, Ford, and further in view of US Patent No. 5,978,649 ("Kahn"). To the extent that this rejection may still apply to the amended claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

As described above, none of Florin, Collings, and Ford teaches the limitations of amended independent claims 1 and 51. Further, Kahn fails to supply that which Florin, Collings, and Ford lack, as evidenced by the fact that the Examiner relies on Kahn solely for the purpose of teaching generating a message due to lack of access rights when a cursor is on a channel (*see* Action mailed January 28, 2008, page 25). Thus, it is clear that amended independent claims 1 and 51 are patentable over Florin, Collings, Ford, and Kahn, whether considered separately or in combination. Dependent claims 37 and 85 are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below.

Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 11345/028001).

Dated: April 28, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By FS #45,079
for Jonathan P. Osha THOMAS SCHLAGER
Registration No.: 33,986
OSHA · LIANG LLP
1221 McKinney St., Suite 2800
Houston, Texas 77010
(713) 228-8600
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant